

Not just class: towards an understanding of the whiteness of middle class schooling choice

Byrne, Bridget

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Byrne, B. (2009). Not just class: towards an understanding of the whiteness of middle class schooling choice. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(3), 424-441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870802629948>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more Information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



**Not just class: towards an understanding of the whiteness
of middle class schooling choice**

Journal:	<i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	RERS-2007-0258.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	class, Race, Education, Whiteness, schooling choice, Bourdieu



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Not just class: towards an understanding of the whiteness of middle class schooling choice.

There is increased attention to questions of class in studies of education, particularly among those who adopt a Bourdieuan perspective. This paper explores the burgeoning literature on school choice and class (in particular middle ‘classness’) to argue that there are serious analytical and sociological costs to a singular focus on class without due attention to race. Examining interview material, it will show instances where the racialised nature of schooling choice has been ignored or overlooked. It argues that viewing the literature through the lens of race and class is imperative for an understanding of the complexities of class and white middle classness in particular.

Race; class; education; schooling choice; whiteness; Bourdieu

1. Introductionⁱ

... Interestingly, one of my (laughs), one of my friends who is my friend now, she was saying to er, something, issue of colour or whatever obviously does come up. And she was saying, she said oh, I don't mean to be awful, but she said um, I'd much rather my children played with your children than the children (laughing) from the estate. And I thought, you know, there's so much, it's not only a colour

1
2
3 *thing, it's a class thing, it's, you know, there's just so much there, isn't it? And it's*
4
5 *amazing how many barriers everyone, not just white people, you know, just*
6
7 *everyone generally with each other, whether it's somebody of a different colour,*
8
9 *or of a different class kind of barriers they put up, and how difficult it is to*
10
11 *surmount those that you don't happen to fit in with. But that, to me was very*
12
13 *interesting.*
14

15
16
17
18 *(Cline et al., 2002: 67)*
19

20
21
22 *'it's very difficult to separate class and race a lot of the time, but I suppose they*
23
24 *do go hand in hand just through necessity, and that's the way things work out*
25
26 *[...] And that's what really worries me about this school, and I think it's sad*
27
28 *because what happens is that I think a lot of people see this, and they don't send*
29
30 *their children there after ... reception, or nursery, and the children get moved*
31
32 *and the mix never ever gets any stronger. The mix doesn't become more like a*
33
34 *mix, as it were. You know. And it's really sad'*
35
36
37

38
39 *(Byrne, 2006: 126)*
40
41
42

43
44 These two quotes, the first from a working class Sikh man talking about sending his
45
46 children to a school where the large majority of the pupils are white, and the second
47
48 from a middle class white woman talking about why she is reluctant to send her
49
50 children to the nearest school demonstrate how the respondents in qualitative
51
52 research are aware of the complexities and intertwining nature of class and race.
53
54

55
56 This paper will explore the burgeoning literature on school choice and interrogate
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

the extent to which it has addressed the intersecting nature of both constructions of and experiences of race and class. This article seeks to tease out this relationship and particularly to ask why the growing literature on the reproduction of middle class privilege has, at least until very recently, largely failed to analyse the racialised nature of its subject. Furthermore, this paper will ask if a Bourdieuan analysis, whilst aiding the resurgence of class as a social category, inhibits the analysis of the inter-relation between race and class. I will first explore the literature on school choice and show how it often ignores questions of race in its focus on class and middle-class practices in particular. I will draw out the implications of Bourdieu’s work for an analysis of racialised as well as classed practices and finally examine research which explores questions of race more successfully.

2. School choice

There has been an explosion of literature on school choice since the market reforms of 1980s (which continue to be rolled out). The 1980 Education Act included the requirement for local education authorities (LEAs) to meet parental preference (the notion of parental choice had been established under section 76 of the 1944 Education Act but had only been implemented on an ad hoc basis) (Croft, 2004: 929). Commitment to parental preference was strengthened in legislation in 1988 and 1989, with the introduction of the principal of funding following the pupil introduced in 1988. While politicians and policy makers claim that parents have

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

been empowered through their new constructions as consumers of educational options for their children, this has been questioned in academic literature and public discussion. The notion of choice and the extent to which this choice is real has been interrogated , particularly given the centralization of the control of the curriculum which limits one significant aspect of what parents are choosing between (Gabriel, 1994). The education market is a complicated terrain. The limits of supply (schools cannot easily ‘spring up’ to meet a demand) means that schools do not operate in a pure market. The cost of some schools being winners in the market for students and funding means that others will be losers. Yet many children still have to attend those ‘losing’ schools. There are only so many places that popular schools can offer for students and for many the notion of choice becomes a fiction in those areas where all the possible choices are unpopular or undesirable. In addition, the operation of different rules of access suggests that the system can be very difficult to negotiate. LEAs have relative freedom to formulate their own mechanisms of prioritising pupils (within certain bounds established by the 2003 Code of Practice on School Admissions (Croft, 2004: 930)). Distance to school remains an important factor in admissions for most schools. There are also various types of (wholly or partially) selective schools – including grammar schools; religious schools and other voluntary aided schools; Academies; Technical Colleges and specialist schools. In addition, there is a complicated system of appeals which parents also have to negotiate (Croft, 2004).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Thus Chris Taylor argues that ‘there now exists a mosaic of different educational markets, where the two key components of the reforms, choice and diversity, are unevenly distributed’ (Taylor, 2001: 368). Archer and Francis (2007: 74) argue that policy documents around school choice are ‘covertly raced and classed discourses’ which will perpetuate inequality by privileging the interests of white, middle class parents. A literature has risen to explore how wealth and class practices are key components in negotiating this uneven distribution. This has led to a concern for the ways in which class has interacted with this policy of choice. As Bev Skeggs argues: ‘choice is a particularly middle-class way of operating in the world’ (2004: 139). Class has increased significance for education where choice amplifies the importance of parental action. The middle classes have particularly come under focus with concerns that they are ‘working the system’ – or in Bourdieuan terms, demonstrating a ‘sense de jeu’.

3. Bourdieu, class and education

The question of class has been the subject of contentious debates within sociology. At the heart of this debate lie two seemingly contradictory trends. The first is that class matters. Socio-economic background has a key and enduring influence in educational outcomes; income distribution; health prospects and participation (see ((Office for National Statistics), 2005). Yet many argue that class no longer matters when the majority see themselves as either having no class or being middle class.

One route out of this impasse is Bourdieuan understandings of class which do not require the identification of cohesive or self-identifying groups or class formations. This approach has been particularly influential in the study of education, partly due to Bourdieu's own interest in education. Bourdieu asserts the need to understand the workings of the social field beyond economics, particularly in the realm of the cultural. For Bourdieu, class is about ways of being, tastes and lifestyles. Education can be important in ensuring the transmission and acquiring of qualifications, but also class codes and cultural capital. 'The 'eye' is a product of history reproduced in education' (Bourdieu, 1994, p5-6). Whilst this 'culturalist' approach to class has been very productive in aiding the analysis of the reproduction of class inequalities in education, this paper will argue that there is frequently a failure to attend to questions of race in this approach.

For Bourdieu : (Bourdieu, 1991), a class is a set of people in a similar position in the 'field' who have shared dispositions and interests which make them act in particular ways (but not necessarily in a co-ordinated way, and not as a group). Class positions are maintained through the exclusionary practice of distinctions and the accumulation and transmission of economic, social and cultural capitals from one generation to the next. Education plays a key role in this as it is not merely about acquiring qualifications. Indeed, there may be constant pressure to acquire more as qualifications can be easily devalued if more people are given access to higher levels of education (Bourdieu, 1994:133). As much as qualification acquisition, education is about the acquisition of taste and the right dispositions which play a critical role in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

creating distinction (Bourdieu, 1994). This makes schools very important in the struggle to maintain position. It is here that Bourdieu’s work has been very useful for those who seek to study the operation of class within the educational system. School, and the composition of school in-take is an area of key concern in the ‘genteel battles’ (or perhaps not so genteel battles) the middle class are engaged in to assert and maintain their positions (Savage et al., 1992: 100). Much of the learning which the middle classes most care about is to be done from fellow pupils as much as teachers. There is a desire to find a school filled with enough ‘people like us’ who will teach children ‘how to be’.ⁱⁱ

In the context of debates around class, the middle classes in particular have been brought more into focus. Regarding education, Power, et al., argued that ‘issues of class cannot be properly illuminated without giving middle-class educational experience the attention it has largely lacked’ (Power et al., 2003: 3). While Power et al., focus on the struggle middle classes engage in to achieve the educational outcomes they want, others have focused more on the exclusionary effects of that process and have used frameworks provided by Bourdieu’s work. Stephen Ball writes that ‘Education as a field of distinctions and identities is crucial in high modern society in changing and reproducing the borderlines of class and distributing unevenly and unequally forms of social and cultural capital’(Ball, 2003: 8). He argues that education policy is ‘aimed at satisfying the concerns and anxieties of the ever anxious middle classes. The market rules of exclusion offer possibilities for

1
2
3 strategic action which many middle-class families are very willing and very able to
4
5 take up' (Ball, 2003: 27).
6
7
8
9

10 Selection of and attendance at school involves a series of dispositions and
11
12 practices which draw on different classed capitals. Economic resources come into
13
14 play. This occurs at the mundane level of ability to visit schools that are further and
15
16 also to contemplate sending a child to a more distant school. But economic resources
17
18 may work at the extreme level of moving house in order to fall into the catchment
19
20 area of a 'better' school. Cultural and social resources are important in giving
21
22 parents the ability to access and assess the 'hot' and 'cold' information on schools –
23
24 from appraising OFSTED reports to using networks to evaluate schools. There is
25
26 evidence that different classes tend to use different sources for this. Diane Reay
27
28 (Reay, 1999) argues that middle class parents are much more confident in dealing
29
30 with the education system in general. This is likely to translate into confidence in
31
32 negotiating the possibilities of choice. The middle classes may make more vigorous
33
34 and successful use of the appeals system and researchers have found that middle
35
36 class parents are quick to argue that their child is specifically gifted and/or needs
37
38 special assistance and treatment which may assist their position in the appeal process
39
40 (Ball, 2003: 37: 62, Devine, 2004: 222). In the transition from primary to secondary
41
42 schools, they may also be better at enlisting teachers and other support, including
43
44 private tuition where entry to grammar schools is based on test results.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Stephen Ball argues: ‘It is within the complex ‘tapestry of practices’ ... in the interlinking of the domestic sphere with public institutions that the work of social reproduction, closure and exclusion gets done. In the interaction between families and institutions, in struggles over scarce resources and valued trajectories, structural and cultural divisions are re-enacted ... For these families class continues to be a critical mediation of being, of who they are.’ (Ball, 2003: 76). Reproduction of class is particularly significant in the examination of what parents look for in schools. The literature argues that middle class parents want a sufficient number of other middle class parents, ‘people like us’: ‘The search for a place of safety is a search for others like us, informed and reinforced by the decisions and advice given by those others like us, whom we trust. A community of aspirations is being sought, people who see and value the future in the same way’ (Ball, 2003: 64). But while this literature makes much of the desire for sufficient ‘people like us’ to give a sense of safety and community, it largely fails to explore how this might be a *racialised* as much as a classed desire. Thus it ignores the extent to which class and race have always been constructed together (see McClintock 1995). The following section will examine this literature in more detail and show how the whiteness of the respondents is often left unexamined.

4. Whiteness, class and school choice

1
2
3 Helen (Charles) asked in 1993 'I have often wondered whether white people *know*
4 that they are white' ((Charles), 1993: 99)? It is often the case that the power of
5
6 whiteness works in such a way as to make white peoples' racialised position and
7
8 experiences unmarked or unnoticed. As Richard Dyer argues: 'because we are seen
9
10 as white, we characteristically see ourselves and believe ourselves seen as
11
12 unmarked, unspecific, universal' (Dyer, 1997: 45). However, in the case of
13
14 education and schooling choice, and particularly in the case of parents considering
15
16 schools for their children in urban relatively multicultural areas, I would argue that
17
18 white people *are* often aware of their whiteness and the racialised nature of their
19
20 choices.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 This is based not only on my own research (Byrne, 2006) but also on the
30
31 material presented in much of the literature which this paper examines. However,
32
33 what seems more curious, and is more damaging for the understanding of the impact
34
35 of the construction of parents as consumers, is that many of those interviewing and
36
37 analyzing the responses do not appear to *know* that (or perhaps if) their respondents
38
39 are white. For instance it is quite common within this literature on the middle classes
40
41 and schooling choice for qualitative research to be written up almost entirely without
42
43 reference to the ethnicity of the respondents (see for example (Ball and Vincent,
44
45 2007, Butler and Robson, 2003, Devine, 2004, Oria et al., 2007, Power et al., 2003).
46
47
48 Where all respondents are white, it appears to be not considered worthy of comment
49
50 or even statement. This suggests that whiteness, or perhaps more particularly white
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

middleclassness, is being constructed as a norm from which others deviate (see (Dyer, 1997, Frankenberg, 1997).

The article ‘Urban education, the middle classes and their dilemmas of school choice’ by Oria et al. (2007) draws on interviews with 28 ‘professional/managerial/ middle class families’ living in Hackney (Oria et al., 2007: 92). At no point are we told the ethnicity of the respondents. The same is true of an article about circuits of education and gentrification by Butler and Robson, based on fieldwork in five sites in London, including Lewisham, Brixton and Wandsworth. We know, for instance that one of the parents is talking about their mixed race child, but we are not told the ethnicity of the interviewee (this situation also crops up in (Ball and Vincent, 2007). In other cases, where both white and non-white parents have been interviewed, we are sometimes told when the respondent is black or Asian, but whiteness is left unmarked (see for example (Power et al., 2003). Interestingly, the respondents themselves often appear to sensitive to issues of race. In almost all articles about schooling choice, questions of race appear in the interviews even when the researcher appears blind to their presence or significance. For instance, in the article by Oria et al. discussed above, Emily appreciates a particular Specialist Art school because it has ‘a wide variety of children in terms of ability and their background ... race as well’ (Oria et al., 2007: 95). Similarly Gemma contrasted the school her children went to with an imaginary ‘very white middle class school’ where they would not have the same experience of being

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘exposed to children from different ethnic backgrounds or social backgrounds or different values’ (Oria et al., 2007: 99-100).

A further example of the failure to analyse the racialised narratives produced by respondents is provided by Tim Butler writing about gentrification processes in Hackney which also focuses on schooling choices. Again, his respondents are explicit in describing the ways in which race and class are brought together in their concerns around schooling: ‘we are coming to the conclusion that our kids would probably not be comfortable in a school where there are an enormous number of black children or really rough white kids which there are around here’ (Butler, 1997: 144). This language is almost dismissed in the analysis ‘[w]ords like “rough” which were used by Harriet would never normally be used in any other context, the references to “black dominated” [...] all suggest a measure of desperation’ (Butler, 1997: 147).

One could argue that the lack of an analysis of race is particularly curious in the context of London where there are high levels of racialised inequality and where local areas (such as Hackney) are frequently understood through racialised discourses. As Paul Gilroy argues: ‘Where once it was the mean streets of the decaying inner city which hosted the most fearsome encounter between white Britons and their most improbably and intimidating other - black youth - now it is the classrooms and staffrooms of the nation’s inner-city schools which frame the same conflict and provide the most potent terms with which to make sense of racial

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

difference’(Gilroy, 1993: p26). In order to be attentive to the intersections between race and class which contribute to making up someone ‘like me’, it is important to be alive to the coded way in which people talk about race. So, for example the ‘inner city’ or ‘urban’ needs to be read through a racialised imaginary. ‘Urban’ ‘gang’ ‘inner-city’ and ‘sink school’ can often be understood as shifting codes for race. Stephen Ball writes about how, for middle class parents who negotiate the state system, their choices are part of a ‘geography of fear and uncertainties, of dangerous places and people’ yet he does not seem willing to analyse the ways in which the respondents whiteness as much as their middle classness plays into this (Ball, 2003: 37).

The easy slippage between ‘urban’ and race for example is sometimes made explicit in interviews, such as the account Mrs Kerr gives in Stephen Ball’s research ‘certainly in an urban area I think you’re going to get, certainly around here it would be completely different cultures as well, and languages spoken, so it was that kind of thing really that makes you think. I think if we were in the country I wouldn’t bat an eyelid about sending them to the local school (Ball, 2003: 66). Thus Mrs Kerr is spelling out for us the terrain on which she is operating and the ways in which she is seeking to reproduce white middle-classness for her children. This is a racialised space, yet this important factor is left un-remarked by Ball. Similarly, Ball notes the invisibility of the working classes in response to a respondent who remarks about her nearest school that ‘nobody’ goes there’ (Ball, 2003: 37: 62). But this may also be a ‘silent antagonism’ of race as much as class. We have no way of telling from

1
2
3 his account. Again in discussions of the desirable 'mix' that the parents are seeking,
4
5 Ball focuses exclusively on social class, whilst his respondents explicitly talk about
6
7 both class and ethnicity. In the following excerpt, Mrs Mankell oscillates between
8
9 talking about ethnicity and class. For her, the two are inextricable:
10
11

12
13
14
15 'these kind of London suburbs are quite unique ... and ... they are moneyed ... I
16
17 hate these terms ... jargon, isn't it ... they're moneyed areas ... people have
18
19 good standard of lives ... whatever middle class means ... doesn't actually mean
20
21 they're all middle-class ... but it has a nice balance, I suppose, of children from
22
23 caring homes. It doesn't have a great ethnic mix. But it certainly has a balance of
24
25 ... it has a balance between children from less caring and more caring homes ... I
26
27 wouldn't say it was predominantly middle-class really ... it hasn't got a very
28
29 good ethnic mix, like a few Asian children, only a couple ... well that's true of
30
31 the borough, this is not a borough with a high proportion of Asian or West Indian
32
33 families particularly, but what we do have is a vast mixture from all over the
34
35 shop'
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Yet the analysis is only focused on the question of the classed mix. There is
45
46 no probing of what the juxtaposition of 'caring' families and 'ethnic mix' might
47
48 mean for understanding white middle classness (Ball, 2003: 37: 63). I would argue
49
50 that the result of these omissions is a poorer understanding of what the interviewees
51
52 mean when they talk about 'mix'. The term suggests more than a concern about
53
54 class but also the negotiation of racialised geographies and identities that
55
56
57
58
59
60

characterise middle classness particularly in urban (and perhaps especially in London) contexts. Often in the study of whiteness, a reading ‘against the grain’ of what respondents are saying needs to be undertaken. However, in these studies, the respondents themselves are worrying about the extent to which they could/should be characterised as ‘pushy middle class white parent[s]’, but the analysis fails to address this (Ball, 2003: 37: p58). They also make clear the sometimes strong emotional responses they have to the ‘wrong’ sort of school which is not white enough. A school which Ball describes as having a ‘high proportion of ethnic minority students’ is described by a parent as ‘a no no school’ and another parent declares: ‘I wouldn’t send her to Saint’s whatever happened, I would probably chain myself to the railings of Borough House (Ball, 2003: 105).

We can see that the respondents are clear that the ethnic mix of schools is something that is important to them when considering the available choices. But why should their whiteness matter to us? Stephen Ball argues that middle-classness, like other class identifications, has to be sought in the subtleties of the everyday, in the uncertainties of status, in fine distinctions as well as gross ones (Ball, 2003: 176). It is here that I would argue that race becomes very important if we are to truly understand the nature of and practices of the middle classness being researched. Because it is not simply middle classness that is the subject of analysis, but *white* middle classness in particular. This particularity needs to be understood, and at times decoded if we are to fully trace the nuances of educational and reproductive choices being made. We have to know what is being reproduced. This involves being more

attentive to what Bourdieu calls a 'network of oppositions' in what makes someone not 'people like us'. These oppositions are not just based on class distinctions but are intermixed with racialised distinctions in sometimes complex ways (as the opening quotes to this paper show). The more explicitly racialised nature of US society and the history of segregation and place of schools as a prime battlefield in struggles around segregation makes the importance of race more obvious for British and US-based researchers (see for example (Devine, 2004). Lareau and McNamara Horvat argue that the race specific nature of given fields, particularly education, needs to be explored. In a study of parents' interactions with teachers and school institutions in the US, they argue that '[a]lthough the terminology is somewhat awkward, we see being white as a cultural resource that white parents unwittingly draw on in their school negotiations in this speaking. Technically speaking, in this field, being white becomes a type of cultural capital' (Lareau and McNamara Horvat, 1999: 42). So, in considering the US case, for example Stephen Ball acknowledges that 'in multi-racial settings, race is a further compounding factor in the choice process and there may well be racial segregation as a result' (Ball, 2003: 37). However, he does not translate this awareness to the British context where race talk and practice is perhaps more coded and made less explicit.ⁱⁱⁱ

The question remains, how far can Bourdieu be held responsible for these omissions. Or, put another way, what conceptual framework is required to put race and class together with more success, particularly in an analysis of privilege? Bourdieu does allow for other forms of distinction to be operating in the field, such

as gender and race.^{iv} However, there is a potential rigidity in his construction of both the field and habitus which makes this understanding difficult to operationalise. As Terry Lovell argues, Bourdieu's sociology is in danger of positioning sex/gender, sexuality and even 'race' as secondary to that of social class' (Lovell, 2000). One problem is that it is difficult to operationalise notions like field and habitus on multiple axes (although this should be possible). The complexities may be overwhelming. Toril Moi argues that gender, like class, needs to be understood as part of a field because of its relational and shifting nature. Thus gender is for Moi, understood not as an autonomous system but as a 'particularly combinatory social category, one that infiltrates and influences every other category' (Moi, cited in (Skeggs, 2004b) p6) The same must also, I would argue, be said for race, but this is rarely accomplished.^v As Terry Lovell argues: 'While class penetrates right through his [Bourdieu's] diagrammatic representation of the social field, like the lettering in Brighton rock, gender is largely invisible, as is race' (Lovell, 2000: 36).^{vi} Lois McNay argues that there is a tendency within Bourdieu's work to reduce symbolic relations to pre-given social relations (McNay, 2004). This tends to give social identities a fixity which obscures their complexity and instability. If we are to understand the multiple interrelations between race, class and gender, then it is possible that Bourdieu's construction of the habitus does not offer sufficiently flexible analysis to reach the complex psychosocial processes behind identification. Archer and Francis for example in their exploration of minority ethnic achievement in schools argue for a multi-layered theoretical framework. As well as using Bourdieu's work, they also draw on post-structuralist theorisations of identification

1
2
3 offered by Stuart Hall and Judith Butler respectively: 'Within this approach, social
4 identities, divisions and inequalities (of race/ethnicity, social class, gender and
5 sexuality) are understood as being brought into being through social life - through
6 talk, actions, policies, practices and so on'. (Archer and Francis, 2007) p25-6). This
7 discursive, performative approach relies on a more diffuse notion of power and the
8 performance and embodiment of identities than is perhaps usually associated with
9 Bourdieu. Archer and Francis argue that 'theories of social class have been primarily
10 formulated with reference to White communities, and hence care must be taken
11 when extending these notions to minority ethnic communities' (Archer and Francis,
12 2007) p34). Thus the next section will briefly explore research on race and education
13 to see to what extent that offers a model for examining white middle classness.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **5. Race and education**

35
36
37
38 Race has been an important component in research on education ever since
39 comparatively larger numbers of racialised minority groups entered the education
40 system in Britain as a result of post-war immigration. Initially, this research focused
41 on essentially conservative issues around how schools might be a site of easing the
42 tensions understood to result from mass immigration of racialised others, or to
43 promote assimilation (Rattansi, 1992). Initially, the focus was on large quantitative
44 studies but there has increasingly been more qualitative and ethnographic work. This
45 shift also marked a general move from cultural deficit models to focus on the
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

process of schooling and was sometimes accompanied by action based research. Thus there has been more attention given to what is going on in schools and in particular an examination of the interactions and learning of children. A major concern has been how schools might be the site of racism (for example in the curriculum, through bullying, through lowered expectations by teachers of black and ethnic minority children)^{vii} – and how might they be sites of education around multiculturalism and anti-racism^{viii}. Education has also been critical in the backlash against anti-racist initiatives. Paul Gilroy points out how classrooms, regarded as the depositaries of national culture, have become a major battleground: ‘the school has become the principal element in the ideology with which the English New Right have sought to attack anti-racism’ (Gilroy, 1993: 26).

There has also been considerable research on the apparently enduring nature of underachievement and how this should be understood (Gillborn, 2006). Recently, research has become more attuned to the complexities of understanding minority ethnic experience in British schools. In particular, there is more awareness of the need to differentiate between different ethnic groups and how trajectories of arrival, settlement and placement in the system have very different outcomes.^{ix} There has also been some interesting work on questions of race, ethnicity and gender. This includes work on racialised masculinities and the ways in which gender and sexuality interact with race in producing different learning cultures and opportunities (see (Archer, 2003, Mac an Ghail, 1996) .

There has been some limited qualitative and quantitative work on the specific question of school choice and race. Irene Bruegel argues that there is a lack of fit between the current Labour Government's rhetoric on social capital and community cohesion and its continuing education reforms: 'the drive for competition between pupils and between schools, sits poorly with the collaboration required to build social capital across diversity' (Bruegel, 2006: 3). Bruegel contends that parental choice systems of school allocation can fuel racism, partly because different groups see the process as weighted against them in obscure ways and partly because it enables parents to act upon their prejudices, to the potential disadvantage of their children. She tracks how in the transition from primary to secondary school the friendships most likely to be ruptured by the move were those that crossed ethnic boundaries (Bruegel, 2006: 3: 9). Quantitative research does suggest that racialised choices *are* being played out in schooling. In a study on schools in England, Johnston et al find that: '[b]oth whites and non-whites are more concentrated into schools with their co-ethnics than predicted by a random allocation model' (Johnston et al., 2004: 246). Thus they find evidence of higher levels of segregation in schools than in residence. In areas that are more ethnically mixed they found more concentration of both whites and non-whites (this was particularly the case with Asian populations) (Burgess et al., 2005)

Nonetheless, as Debbie Weekes-Bernard (Weekes-Bernard, 2007) points out, the literature of school choice has often failed to look at ethnicity. In a study of Black and minority ethnic parents, she argues that the notion of choice is largely

1
2
3 rhetorical. Parents are not actually able to choose the schools they would most want,
4
5 rather they are expressing merely a preference. Muslim parents in particular had
6
7 strong desires for Muslim faith schools which are largely not available in the state
8
9 system. Some parents were actively choosing schools where there was a large
10
11 presence or majority of black and Asian students – to avoid racism and bullying^x,
12
13 while others were avoiding those very schools: ‘A small minority of aspirant Black
14
15 and Asian parents actively avoid schools that are Black/Asian majority, engaging,
16
17 where affordable, in high rates of residential and educational flight despite their own
18
19 awareness of the risks associated with educating their children in predominantly
20
21 White schools’ (Weekes-Bernard, 2007: 41). This results in a complex negotiation
22
23 of class and race for those parents: ‘[You are] trying to get your child to stay away
24
25 from certain types of children. Now these certain types, some of these are Black. So
26
27 you find yourself in this really weird situation where you are staying Black and true
28
29 to yourself, but you are staying away because you are trying to get your child out of
30
31 a Black environment and into a White environment that you know they are going to
32
33 struggle in anyway. But you know they are going to have a better education... as
34
35 parents [we] battle with our ethnicity [but] we put our children in a battle as well’
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 (Weekes-Bernard, 2007: 41).

45
46
47
48 Black and minority ethnic parents have a sense of the ‘risk’ of encountering
49
50 racism. This presents a different response to importance of mix and social and ethnic
51
52 background of school intake than that of white parents and one which arouses
53
54 difficult questions of identity: ‘I remember I took my son to Northgram primary
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 school. He was the only little Black boy there – sat at a table with four little White
4
5 boys and they had their names on and they're all looking at him like, what are you
6
7 doing here? And he looked round at me and said 'it's ok you can go Mummy' and I
8
9 wanted to cry – I didn't want to leave him' (Weekes-Bernard, 2007: 41-2). This also
10
11 has consequences for children as Diane Reay and Helen Lucey point out in their
12
13 study of 'demonised' schools: '[w]hile children, across race and class, could make
14
15 identical criticisms of 'bad' schools, such judgements signified very differently, as
16
17 for white middle-class children, pupils at such schools are 'a distanced other', while
18
19 black and white working-class children they implicate 'people like me' ...There are
20
21 painful social and psychological consequences for these minority ethnic working
22
23 class children which the white middle class children can avoid, in particular, the
24
25 effort of pushing the 'demonized' other out when it is conflated with the self' (Reay
26
27 and Lucey, 2003: 130).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The majority of work which examines questions of race and education
38
39 focuses, perhaps understandably, on ethnic minorities. A significant exception to this
40
41 is the focus on the white working classes who are becoming a key site of policy and
42
43 academic debate (see (Evans, 2006). It could be argued that the white working class,
44
45 and particularly white working class boys are subject to similar scrutiny that marked
46
47 black and other ethnic minorities in the early years of research – where notions of
48
49 cultural deficit and 'refusal' to be educated are still circulating. For example,
50
51 Raveaud and van Zanten argue that middle class parents talking about school choice
52
53 are reluctant to express views which may be seen as racist, but do not always have
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

the same reservations around class: ‘while it appears unacceptable to attribute negative educational effects to the presence of minority ethnic children, there is no such constraint on criticism directed towards other social classes. Pupils from lower social classes are occasionally presented as ‘anti-social’, ‘nasty’, ‘the horrible ones’ likely to induce anti-school peer pressure’ (Raveaud and van Zanten, 2007: 117). An alternative formation of this debate argues that white working class boys are feeling ‘left out’ in the new re-making of British identity and celebrations of diversity – they have no identity to celebrate.^{xi} Whilst these debates mark the whiteness of the working class, they still leave the white middle classes unmarked and unexamined (and therefore somehow outside of the operations of both racism and racialisation). Where whiteness appears to be marginal (in the case of white working class boys) it can be brought into focus. Where it is a component of privilege, it becomes a ‘ghost’ unable to be seen (Goldberg, 1997: 83).

Diane Reay and Helen Lucey argue that ‘Social class, race, social exclusion and social exclusivity are all intertwined in secondary school choice in the inner city’ (Reay and Lucey, 2004: 37). They also argue that safety concerns are ‘frequently constructed through racialised, territorialized and, for some boys’ schools, gendered lenses’ (Reay and Lucey, 2004: 45). Diane Reay and others are currently examining those white middle classes who ‘actively choosing the type of inner city comprehensives that most white middle classes avoid’ (Reay, 2007). This work shows some of the different ways in which race and class interact. This includes the idea of a cosmopolitan disposition, where some middle class parents see themselves

as providing their children with the capacity to move around comfortably and operate successfully in multicultural contexts. This suggests an adaptation to the global economy. Reay et al also argue that white middle class parents sometimes use black and ethnic minority children symbolically to mark the distance between themselves and the white working classes. Thus a parent remarks that a school she sends her child to is 'very low on the white trash factor'.^{xii}

Reay et al. (2004) are examining perhaps an exception in terms of the white middle classes in that they directly sought out those who are actively choosing schools that many are avoiding (by manipulating the system or geographical relocation). This leaves the challenge to engage not only with those more unusual parents, but the norm of the white middle classes who have specific raced, as well as classed imaginaries of the desired school fellows for their children. As Anoop Nayak points out, it is often harder to engage with 'the normalcy of whiteness as ordinary, monotonous or humdrum' (Nayak, 2003: p140).

6. Conclusion

This paper has shown some of the ways in which the analysis of empirical material is weakened by a singular focus on class. It has argued that whilst the respondents in research on middle-class schooling choice appear to frequently flag race as a relevant issue, this has not always been picked up by researchers. Whilst the use of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Bourdieuian notions of distinction in class habitus have been productive in enabling an analysis of the class nature of parental action around schooling, there needs to be more recognition of the intersections between race and class in making up middle classness in Britain. This requires a more nuanced understanding of the shifting terrain on which the idea of ‘people like us’ is constructed, as well as attention to where the ‘middle class’ practices and discourses discovered would be better described those of the white middle classes. Acknowledging the mutually constitutive nature of social categories also opens up the scope of thinking through the racialised nature of social reproduction and social capital that are so critical to education. In addition, considerations of the racialised nature of parental choices would call for a further critical examination of education reforms which could be argued to increase both prejudice and concentrate privilege.

Exploration of how white middle class practices around school choice are producing and reproducing racialised as well as classed inequalities and exclusions is one route in to the examination of the ‘normalcy of whiteness’. The marking of class as also racialised also helps to open up the exploration of the practices of non-white middle classes around schooling choice. Are Black, Asian and other ethnic minorities making similar choices to their white counterparts around schooling or how and why are they engaging in different practices? How are different ethnic groups internally differentiated, and how do their choices differ? Do different ethnic groups (including whites) meet a different reception from schools and teachers? For example, is the ‘pushy’ black parent received in a different way from the ‘pushy’

white parent?^{xiii} If this empirical research agenda were pursued, it would also enable a more engaged debate with Bourdieuan understandings of the social world and social interaction and how they might enable the analysis of racialised as well as classed practices.

References

- (CHARLES), H. 1993 'Queer nigger': theorizing 'white' activism', in BRISTOW, J. & WILSON, A. R. (eds) *Activating theory. Lesbian, gay, bisexual politics*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- (OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS), O. 2005 'Focus on Social Inequalities: 2005 Edition'. London: TSO.
- ARCHER, L. 2003 *Race, Masculinity and Schooling. Muslim boys and education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- ARCHER, L. & FRANCIS, B. 2007 *Understanding Minority Ethnic Achievement. Race, gender, class and 'success'*. London and New York: Routledge.
- BALL, S. J. 1998 'Race', Space and the Further Education Market Place', *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 171-189.
- 2003 *Class Strategies and the Education Market. The middle classes and social advantage*. London and New York: Routledge.
- BALL, S. J., REAY, D. & DAVID, M. 2002 'Ethnic Choosing': Minority Ethnic students and higher education choice', *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 333-357.

- 1
2
3 BALL, S. J. & VINCENT, C. 2007 'Education, Class Fractions and the Local Rules
4 of Spacial Relations', *Urban Studies*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1175-1189.
5
6
7
8 BONNETT, A. 2000 *Anti-racism*. London: Routledge.
9
10 BOURDIEU, P. 1991 'Social space and the genesis of 'class'', in THOMPSON, J. B.
11 (ed) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
12
13 --- 1994 *Distinction*. London: Routledge.
14
15
16
17 BRUEGEL, I. 2006 'Social Capital, Diversity and Education Policy'. London:
18 Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group, London South Bank
19 University.
20
21
22
23
24 BURGESS, S., WILSON, D. & LUPTON, R. 2005 'Parallel Lives? Ethnic
25 Segregation in schools and Neighbourhoods', *Urban Studies*, vol. 42, no. 7,
26 pp. 1027-1056.
27
28
29
30
31 BUTLER, T. 1997 *Gentrification and the middle classes*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
32
33
34 BUTLER, T. & ROBSON, G. 2003 'Plotting the middle classes: gentrification and
35 circuits of education in London', *Housing Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 5-28.
36
37
38 CLINE, T., DE ABREU, G., FIHOSY, C., GRAY, H., LAMBERT, H. & NEALE, J.
39 2002 'Minority Ethnic Pupils in Mainly White Schools'. London: Department
40 of Education and Skills.
41
42
43
44
45 CROFT, J. 2004 'Positive Chocie, No Choice or Total Rejection: the perennial
46 problem of school catchments, housing and neighbourhoods', *Housing*
47 *Studies*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 927-945.
48
49
50
51
52 DEVINE, F. 2004 *Class Practices. How parents help their children get good jobs*.
53 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 DYER, R. 1997 *White*. London: Routledge.
4
5
6 EVANS, G. 2006 *Educational Failure and Working Class White Children in Britain*
7
8 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
9
10 FRANKENBERG, R. 1997 'Introduction: Local whiteness, localizing whiteness', in
11
12 FRANKENBERG, R. (ed) *Displacing Whiteness. Essays in Social and*
13
14 *Cultural Criticism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
15
16
17 GABRIEL, J. 1994 *Racism, Culture, Markets*. London: Routledge.
18
19
20 GILLBORN, D. 2006 'Rethinking white supremacy. Who counts in 'WhiteWorld',
21
22 *Ethnicities*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 318-340.
23
24
25 GILROY, P. 1993 *Small Acts. Thoughts on the Politics of Black Culture*. London:
26
27 Serpent's Tail.
28
29 GOLDBERG, D. T. 1997 *Racial Subjects. Writing on race in America*. London:
30
31 Routledge.
32
33
34 HAGE, G. 1998 *White Nation. Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural*
35
36 *society*. Melbourne and London: Pluto Press.
37
38
39 HANCOCK, B. H. 2005 'Steppin' out of Whiteness', *Ethnography*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp.
40
41 427-461.
42
43
44 HARTIGAN, J. J. 2005 *Odd Tribes. Toward a cultural analysis of white people*.
45
46 Durham and London: Duke University Press.
47
48
49 HARTIGAN JR., J. 1997 'Unpopular culture: the case of 'white trash'', *Cultural*
50
51 *Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 316-343.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- HAYLETT, C. 2000 'Illegitimate subjects? Abject whites, neoliberal modernisation and middle class multiculturalism', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 19, pp. 351-70.
- HEWITT, R. 1986 *White Talk Black Talk: inter-racial friendship and communication amongst adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JOHNSTON, R., WILSON, D. & BURGESS, S. 2004 'School segregation in multiethnic England', *Ethnicities*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 237-265.
- LAREAU, A. & MCNAMARA HORVAT, E. 1999 'Moments of Social Inclusion and Exclusion Race, Class, and Cultural Capital in Family-School Relationships', *Sociology of Education*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 37-53.
- LOVELL, T. 2000 'Thinking feminism with and against Bourdieu', in FOWLER, B. (ed) *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- MAC AN GHAILL, M. 1996 'What about the boys?': schooling, class and crisis masculinity', *The Sociological Review*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 381-97.
- MCNAY, L. 2004 'Agency and experience: gender as a lived relation', in ADKINS, L. & SKEGGS, B. (eds) *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- NAYAK, A. 2003 *Race, place and globalization. Youth cultures in a changing world*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- ORIA, A., CARDINI, A., BALL, S., STAMOU, E., KOLOKITHA, M., VERTIGAN, S. & FLORES-MORENO, C. 2007 'Urban education, the

- middle classes and their dilemmas of school choice', *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 91-105.
- POWER, S., EDWARDS, T., WHITTY, G. & WIGFALL, G. 2003 *Education and the middle class*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- RATTANSI, A. 1992 'Changing the subject? Racism, culture and education', in DONALD, J. & RATTANSI, A. (eds) *'Race', Culture and Difference*. London: Sage Publications.
- RAVEAUD, M. & VAN ZANTEN, A. 2007 'Choosing the local school: middle class parents' values and social and ethnic mix in London and Paris', *Journal of Educational Policy*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 107-124.
- REAY, D. 1999 'Linguistic capital and home-school relationships: mother's interactions with their children's primary school teachers', *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 159-168.
- 2007 'A darker shade of pale?'. Whiteness, the middle classes and multi-ethnic inner city schooling', *Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1041-1060.
- REAY, D. & LUCEY, H. 2003 'The Limits of 'Choice': Children and Inner city schooling', *Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 121-142.
- 2004 'Stigmatised Choices: social class, social exclusion and secondary school markets in the inner city', *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 35-51.
- SAVAGE, M., BARLOW, J., DICKENS, P. & FIELDING, T. 1992 *Property, Bureaucracy and Culture. Middle class formation in contemporary Britain*. London: Routledge.

SKEGGS, B. 2004a *Class, Self, Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

--- 2004b 'Context and Background: Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of class, gender and sexuality', in ADKINS, L. & SKEGGS, B. (eds) *Feminsim after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwells.

SMAJE, C. 1997 'Not just a social construct: Theorising race and ethnicity', *Sociology*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 307-327.

TAYLOR, C. 2001 'The geography of choice and diversity in the 'new' secondary education market of England', *Area*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 368-381.

TROYNA, B. & HATCHER, R. 1992 *Racism in Children's Lives. A study of mainly-white primary schools*. London: Routledge.

WEEKES-BERNARD, D. 2007 'School Choice and Ethnic Segregation. Educational Decision-making among Black and Minority Ethnic Parents'. London: The Runnemedede Trust.

WILLIAMS, K. & MAYLOR, U. 2007 'I do think they think Black children are uneducable': Black middle class parents' accounts of managing their children's education', *The Educated Family? Middle class families and education*. London Metropolitan University.

YUVAL-DAVIS, N. 1992 'Fundamentalism, multiculturalism and women in Britain', in DONALD, J. & RATTANSI, A. (eds) *'Race', culture and difference*. London: Sage Publications.

Notes

BRIDGET BYRNE is a lecture in the Department of Sociology at the University of
Manchester

ADDRESS: Sociology, University of Manchester, Arthur Lewis Building, Oxford
Road, Manchester M13 9PL. Email bridget.byrne@manchester.ac.uk

ⁱ Thanks to Virinder Kalra, Wendy Bottero and the anonymous reviewers for comments.

ⁱⁱ In addition, and particularly at primary level, much of the out-of-school social life of the child and mother may be shaped by fellow pupils (see Byrne, 2006).

ⁱⁱⁱ Stephen Ball is well aware of the significance of race in other research he is involved in. See BALL, S. J. 1998 'Race', Space and the Further Education Market Place', *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 171-189, BALL, S. J., REAY, D. & DAVID, M. 2002 'Ethnic Choosing': Minority Ethnic students and higher education choice', *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 333-357..

^{iv} For an example of how Bourdieu can be usefully applied to the study of race see HANCOCK, B. H. 2005 'Steppin' out of Whiteness', *Ethnography*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 427-461.. See also SMAJE, C. 1997 'Not just a social construct: Theorising race and ethnicity', *Sociology*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 307-327.. Both argue for the importance of Bourdieu's approach to bodily practices for understandings of race.

^v Although see HAGE, G. 1998 *White Nation. Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. Melbourne and London: Pluto Press. for a Bourdieuan approach to national identity and belonging.

^{vi} An exception to this would be *La Misere du Monde* where Bourdieu addresses race more directly.

^{vii} See TROYNA, B. & HATCHER, R. 1992 *Racism in Children's Lives. A study of mainly-white primary schools*. London: Routledge. HEWITT, R. 1986 *White Talk Black Talk: inter-racial friendship and communication amongst adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

^{viii} See YUVAL-DAVIS, N. 1992 'Fundamentalism, multiculturalism and women in Britain', in DONALD, J. & RATTANSI, A. (eds) *'Race', culture and difference*. London: Sage Publications, RATTANSI, A. 1992 'Changing the subject? Racism, culture and education', in DONALD, J. & RATTANSI, A. (eds) *'Race', Culture and Difference*. London: Sage Publications, BONNETT, A. 2000 *Anti-racism*. London: Routledge..

^{ix} See ARCHER, L. & FRANCIS, B. 2007 *Understanding Minority Ethnic Achievement. Race, gender, class and 'success'*. London and New York: Routledge. for an exploration of British Chinese involvement in the education system

^x See also REAY, D. & LUCEY, H. 2003 'The Limits of 'Choice': Children and Inner city schooling', *Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 121-142..

^{xi} See HAYLETT, C. 2000 'Illegitimate subjects? Abject whites, neoliberal modernisation and middle class multiculturalism', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 19, pp. 351-70, SKEGGS, B. 2004a *Class, Self, Culture*. London and New York: Routledge. on the racialisation of the white working class in Britain.

^{xii} See HARTIGAN, J. J. 2005 *Odd Tribes. Toward a cultural analysis of white people*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, HARTIGAN JR., J. 1997 'Unpopular culture: the case of 'white trash'', *Cultural Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 316-343. for discussion of 'white trash'.

^{xiii} Work by WILLIAMS, K. & MAYLOR, U. 2007 'I do think they think Black children are uneducable': Black middle class parents' accounts of managing their children's education', *The Educated Family? Middle class families and education*. London Metropolitan University. would suggest that this is the case.